Sidelight on an unwilling grey eminence - Schlosser as '*Schlüsselfigur*'

Karl Johns

Preface: Editor's introduction

This paper was originally presented at a colloquium that I organized in the Art History Department of the University of Glasgow in 2009. A selection of the papers was published in book form by Mitchell B. Frank and Daniel Adler as *German Art History and Scientific Thought* by Ashgate in 2012. A number of the other papers appeared as a section in the very first issue of this journal, *Number 1 December 2009*, as ***The Vienna School of Art History*.** That section included 'Karl Johns, "Julius von Schlosser and the need to reminisce" 1-KJ/1', which offered a contextualization of Schlosser's famous paper on the history of 'The Vienna School of Art History'.[i] In the same issue of the journal Karl published a translation of Schlosser's paper: 'Karl Johns, "Julius von Schlosser, 'The Vienna school of the history of art (1934)'" 1-KJ/2**'.** He did not, however, publish the paper that he originally presented in Glasgow. Browsing through the original conference papers, I came across Karl's original paper and decided that with the current attention being paid to Schlosser, by Getty Publications[ii] and the recent Schlosser conference in Vienna,[iii] it should be published as it was presented. It will supplement his review of the new Getty translation of Schlosser's *Die Kunst- und Wunderkammern der Spätrenaissance : ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sammelwessens* (Leipzig 1908).[iv]

---

[i] 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Institut für Geschichtsforschung,* Ergänzungs-Band 13, Heft 2, Innsbruck: Wagner 1934**.**

[ii] First the publication of the translation of Schlosser's 'History of Portraiture in Wax' in *Ephemereal Bodies: Wax Sculpture and the Human Figure* edited by Roberta Panzanelli, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute 2008, and then Julius von Schlosser, *Art and Curiosity Cabinets of the Late Renaissance: A Contribution to the History of Collecting*, edited by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, translation by Jonathan Blower, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2021. The French are way ahead of the Getty in translating Schlosser's books.

[iii] See Matthew Rampley (University of Birmingham), 'Julius von Schlosser: aesthetics, art history and the book', *Report on the 150th Anniversary Conference on Julius von Schlosser, 6th and 7th October 2016: Julius von Schlosser (1866–1938), Internationale Tagung zum 150. Geburtstag, gemeinsam veranstaltet vom Kunsthistorischen Museum Wien und dem Institut für Kunstgeschichte der Universität Wien* 15/MR2.

[iv] 'Julius Schlosser breaks yet another barrier'. Review of: Julius von Schlosser, *Art and Curiosity Cabinets of the Late Renaissance: A Contribution to the History of Collecting*, edited by

Karl Johns: Sidelight on an Unwilling Grey Eminence - Schlosser as 'Schlüsselfigur', *Viennese Art Historiography 1854-1938*, University of Glasgow, 1-4 October 2009

While Riegl, Dvořák, Sedlmayr and Pächt have each of them aroused widespread enthusiasm at one point or another, the same cannot be said of Julius Schlosser (1866-1938). To speak in general terms about his intellectual trajectory and its significance, one meets two questions, the first rather obvious, and the other quite opaque. Although he wrote and lectured in a style that was difficult, his arguments were consistent and perhaps predictable – a continuation of Wickhoff's approach, and the principles upheld by the Institut für Geschichtsforschung, as well as something later called structure and system, which is most apparent today in his thoughts about what he called the language and grammar of art, but also in his study from 1889 of the original architectural layout of western European abbeys which is a very early example of a functional analysis. In the last decade or two of his life he seems by contrast to have made some generalizations apparently difficult to reconcile with his earlier devotion to the particularity of historical sources.

Since the "Herr Hofrat"- as he was addressed in the halls of the university and along the Gumpendorfer Strasse - did not save any of his correspondence, and always sought to conceal his individual and personal life behind his publications, the more intimate information about his approach to the growing mountain of information that began to overwhelm later 19th century scholarship can only be gleaned from occasional asides, favorite images, and some of the poetic flights which animate his writing from beginning to end.

The art historians trained in Vienna before the war presented a sort of continuity in their work which probably distinguishes them from those of German universities. If we ask ourselves how the atmosphere, method and chosen subjects of the Viennese art historians differed from what was occurring in Berlin, Bonn and a lesser extent Leipzig, we find the question of Cimabue to present itself as exemplary.

> Franz Wickhoff "Über die Zeit des Guido von Siena," *MiöG* 10, Heft 2, 1889, pp. 244-286. Julius Schlosser. "Die florentinische Künstleranekdote" within the Prolegomena 1910 reprinted in *Präludien*, Bard 1927. Max Dvořák, "Zur Diskussion über Cimabue," *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, 1913, 3-4 pp. 75-83, M. D. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kunstgeschichte*, Munich: Piper 1929, pp. 354-360. Gombrich returned to the same passage as a point of departure for his essay: "The Renaissance Idea of Artistic Progress" (originally 1952), *Norm and Form*, London: Phaidon 1966, p. 3.

Dante (*Purgatorio* 11, 94-96) had developed the famous trope of the artistic generations successively improving on the refinement of their predecessors in generating natural illusion. “In painting Cimabue thought to hold the field and now Giotto has the cry, so that the other’s fame is dim. So has the one Guido taken from the other the glory of our tongue…” (Sinclair translation pp. 146-147). From this moment on into the 16th century, the commentaries to the Divine Comedy accrued anecdotes about Cimabue (Cenni di Peppi) and attributions to him. None of this “information” was true, but it survives in the handbooks and guides to Assisi to this very day.

> The Anonimo Fiorentino first described Cimabue as “the greatest painter in Italy” proposed that the family of the Cimabue-Gualtieri were his descendants.
>
> Ghiberti mentioned him without referring to a single work.
>
> Francesco Albertini Memoriale, published 1510, d. 1520, the earliest guide book for Florence, attributed the Rucellai Madonna, and the Crucifix in the S Croce chapter house to Cimabue.
>
> Antonio Billi 1481-1530, add the Assisi upper basilica frescoes by a process of elimination – or rather its opposite.
>
> The Anonimo Magliabechiano 1537-1542, continued the attribution of the frescoes in Assisi.
>
> Giorgio Vasari wrote his biographical novel of the basis of these predecessors. An entire oeuvre and biography had been constructed with no objective basis whatsoever. My Assisi guide book of 1992 still includes the attributions to Cimabue.

Only a single surviving work can with certainty be associated with Cimabue, and this is a heavily restored mosaic of only a single figure of St. John within a larger scheme at Pisa Cathedral (1301-1302). This did and does not deter a thriving industry of fanciful attributions, and the repetition of embroidered anecdotes of his life and work as this was peculiarly characteristic of Florence, continuing all of the way to Andreas Aubert (1907)[v] and John White Pelican Volume (1966).[vi] Schlosser finally made the point, uncharacteristically coarse and direct, saying that such contradictions of the published primary materials “are no longer acceptable”. One can see how much more careful were Schlosser and his colleagues from what still today remains the mainstream.

This example fell into the field of the 14th century – the great transitional period from the medieval to the “modern” world view, which turned out to be the favorite subject of Schlosser. After completing his studies under Wickhoff and

---

[v] *Die malerische Dekoration der San Francesco Kirche in Assisi: Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Cimabue,* pub. K. W. Hiersemann, 1907.

[vi] *Art and Architecture in Italy, 1250-1400,* pub. Pelican History of Art Series, 1966.

working as curator and director of the Kunsthistorisches Museum for approximately thirty years, Schlosser accepted the chair of art history at the University of Vienna after the premature death of Max Dvořák. As you are aware, this was after he had already previously turned down the same offer from Prague and Vienna at least once. Although he did this ostensibly to save the tradition of Viennese art history as it had been founded by his mentor among the famously savage book reviews of the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, Schlosser himself was a reticent personality, almost shy, striking students for his polite character [as I have told by at least two of them], obviously obsequious within the imperial bureaucracy, and characteristically avoiding book reviewing. This is quite a striking personal trait in comparison to Dvořák or the Tietzes who were popular socially and as lecturers, but devastating in their book reviews. Erwin Panofsky once recorded the trepidation that was widely felt in facing the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*.

Among the most decisive figures in defining the academic subject of the history of art – as I am arguing him to be – Schlosser might possibly be the only one to have identified himself as a subject specialist – a medievalist, and also as a museum curator uncomfortable in a lecture hall. Burckhardt, Wölfflin, Emile Mâle, Focillon, Vöge, Goldschmidt, Pinder, Clemen, Warburg, Saxl, Panofsky, Meyer Schapiro were all people who lectured and lectured, and did not pursue their individual subjects into the same material detail, nor did they study the grander philosophical ramifications of aesthetics in the same critical way as Schlosser did to the end of his days. In fact, Warburg was his closest friend in this, and parallels from Vienna to the Warburg Institute are as much due to Schlosser as to Saxl. As many of you know, Schlosser also wrote in a unique style with multiple subordinate clauses, elliptic sentences, many Latin and Italian terms and a group of favorite expressions – such as "*innerlich*" and "*äußerlich*". These were small aspects of usage which anticipated the big questions which dovetailed with Croce.

If we describe our gentle scholar as the grey eminence who dominated the history of art in Vienna during a protracted and critical period, I presume that nobody will disagree.

Arma virumque cano. The man has been obscured by the success of the book. Julius Schlosser will remain the only individual to have studied the history of art theory and documentary publications as broadly and comprehensively as he did from antiquity to his own time.

None will deny that he was a central figure in the growth and influence of Viennese art history. In his essay of 1935, Schlosser might have been the one to most forcefully popularize the name of the "Vienna School of Art History." In an autobiographical essay he spoke quite candidly and unprepossessingly of his own intellectual interests, what he called his crisis, and of changes he made through the course of his career – which ran from the middle of Franz Joseph's reign to the Anschluß (1889-1936/8). He lectured at the University of Vienna from 1892 to 1936. His life nearly spanned the entire period addressed by all of us together.

Why travel so far to flog a dead horse? We already know all of this – or this at least was the attitude of Eva Frodl when I was able to spend a pleasant afternoon speaking to her about these things a number of years ago. In the many years before completing my own dissertation, I did not hear the name of Schlosser mentioned a single time in any of the three countries where I was enrolled.

Schlosser's personality would seem to have included an intensity, no space for complacency, strong opinions about aesthetic questions, and certainly a demand for rigor in matters of paleography, language, linguistics, and written sources. He might have been specialized in a field where the anonymity of the objects kept him remote from questions about attributions, but was pedantic enough to lead the students to dutifully repeat many of the things he liked to hear (quotations from Croce and Julius Lange), but then on the other hand the students recalled him as an unusually polite, shy and soft spoken person. While Franz Wickhoff had more or less defined the character of what would come to be called the Vienna school – largely on the basis of sardonic book reviews, Schlosser published only two reviews in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, but then never again reviewed a book. This was another aspect of his conception of "*Kunstliteratur*" – it is silly to simply contradict an author in a book review but in the perfect world one should rather quietly publish the proof that refutes them. Until the later part of his life, he appears almost to have refrained from any negative remarks about others, and seems – from the obsequious footnotes – to have been out to get along with everybody. This might account for his success within the bureaucracy, and perhaps from the coziness he seems to have felt at the museum. This seems clear from scattered off hand remarks occurring at rare moments in his essays. If there was anything negative to be said, he seems to have felt it better to simply provide an example to disprove something. In the case of Riegl's ideas about the early Christian Basilica, he simply quotes a line from Lucretius – as I recall – which makes it very obvious that there was indeed an appreciation of the lines of perspective and the vanishing point already at that time [Lucretius Book 4, 422].[vii]

His significant work which is overshadowed by the success of the *Kunstliteratur* is published in his early essays [largely though not exclusively in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*]. These reveal the basic trends of his thinking. His predecessors had all written specific essays about the problems of "*Universalgeschichte*," and the questions of how an objective organization can be discerned amid the growing flood of information. Schlosser characteristically did not ever write about the question abstractly, but instead used examples in his care as a curator. In this, there are I believe certain parallels to some of the famous studies by Marcel Mauss, who was roughly contemporary and introduced the same anthropological aspect to his materials in a similar way that is to say from a library reading room – in any case without field work. While Mauss will reiterate data about the Inuit tribes, and then without missing a beat suddenly be speaking about binary oppositions between the seasons or individualism and collectivism, Schlosser

[vii] *De rerum natura.*

proceeded differently, and the craft of these essays in the Jahrbuch is worth considering. In each of these essays, he found an obscure object from Ambras Castle or other collections, and then slowly and deliberately with often remote historical sources, gradually and progressively expanded toward a broad conclusion about the period with methodological implications for the study of all earlier art and cultural phenomena. The subjects were chosen for their application to individual sets of questions such as the role of the patron, shifting functions, the relative place of iconographical data, and always the relativity of national characteristics and preferences.

These 16 voluminous studies appeared in the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* (1892-1914), deal almost exclusively with subjects from the 14th century, not only because they possibly appealed to him, but he at one point described his subject as a "methodological specimen" presented as "ideal series", shedding light on a significant and revelatory transitional period, much like late antiquity, which provided the other period to provoke his interest and that of his predecessors. These studies are set in a period of nearly complete anonymity, where attributions to specific artists are impossible or irrelevant. This again distinguishes his work from that of Thausing and Wickhoff in the Albertina.

The arts and their development have a material basis and rise out of a nearly timeless anthropological substratum. Unlike Riegl and others, Schlosser found a holozoic basis for more objective research. This recalls his remarks about "*misura*" as a favorite concept of Lorenzo Ghiberti. While Riegl was emoting about the Christian idealism that created the gold ground in painting or created shifts in the relation to *Stimmung* or other universal subjects, his younger colleague was publishing sources that revealed the broader chronology, Schlosser was anticipating the qualities of "structure" – that an analysis must be concrete, simple and explanatory. His models had been in the studies Wickhoff had made of architectural functions and other topics.

Wax was one of the interesting materials. It formed the basis for studies of seals and stamps as well as the portraiture in wax from ancient Syria to Madame Thussaud. The dissertation by Rudolf Chimani was devoted to the art history of the Austrian seals. It was used in Rome and Constantinople, according to Josephus, wax formed a part of the decoration of the temple of Herod. Warburg's essay about the votive figures in SS Annunziata in Florence was written roughly concurrently with Schlosser's Portraiture in Wax, and this was after Schlosser and Warburg had met at the hotel in Florence, and presumably discussed these things among others.

Bone was the material of the medieval ceremonial saddles, possibly used in jousts – a more likely simply as ceremonial representational signs of status. They present a short lived historical phenomenon highlighting irrational behavior in the courtly circles. These were largely made for royal and noble patrons in 14th-15th century Austrian area, but presumably in a workshop in northern Italy, possibly Reggio Emilia or Mantua.

Ivory formed the basis of the Embriachi workshop, a Genoese family settled in Venice, which continued subjects from ancient and later secular poetry through most of the medieval period with very lucrative results, even competing successfully with their French rivals. It was a favorite material of the virtuosi of the later classicist periods, as he would have called them.

Tapestry and textile appealed to him particularly since most of the monuments are lost and known only from documentary records. He made the edition of the *Burgundischer Paramentenschatz* and wrote about the ekphrasis of Emperor Manuel from Constantinople based on a presumed 14th century French tapestry seen in Paris during his negotiations there, as well as other essays involving French 14th century patronage and collecting, also in the subject of poverty in art "*Armeleutekunst*" again recalling Warburg and the "Arbeitende Bauern auf Flämischen Tapeten". This was almost peculiar – though not exclusively – to the realm of courtly art, which he distinguished as one of the three circles of 14th century art – beside scholastic and bourgeois patronage.

Bronze was at the core of the sustained studies of Lorenzo Ghiberti and occurs in the essays about sculpture. Ghiberti had created a bronze foundry to produce his doors for the Florence baptistery and trained most of the younger artists in Florence. It was from here that Donatello proceeded to inspire the culture of small scale bronze sculpture which became a key element of Renaissance art and led to the workshop of Antico and reproductive sculpture in Padua (discussed at length in the "Bildnerwerkstatt" and the "Paralipomena"). Unlike the "Limewood Sculpture" (by his intellectual grandchild) this had more complex connotations for the Rinascimento. It was a genre comparable to The Dutch Group Portrait, to the Entstehung der Kathedrale, the Late antique and Romanesque Palaces by K M Swoboda, the Baroque Ceilings by Hans Tietze, the Early Christian Basilica of Riegl. To Schlosser and Planiscig, the small scale bronze seems to have assumed significance as a key to understanding the period of humanism, similar to the way in which Sedlmayr later spoke of "*die Mitte*" – finding the central point from which all other aspects become clear.

I might just mention gold, and that Bodonyi's dissertation – a subject suggested to him by Schlosser – might be the earliest monographic study of an individual color, The medals which Schlosser studied most profoundly, both forged and original, were struck and cast in all of these materials, he tirelessly reminded his readers that his hero, Ghiberti, had begun as a goldsmith, and that these examples were however sadly all lost. Ernst Kris also devoted close attention to Jamnitzer and the documentation of lost works made from natural casts. This was as interesting as a color which was also a metal, an element in the periodic table, and how this affected its symbolism and popular superstitions.

Another center of attention lay in the artistic centers, their qualities, their peculiarities, origins, forces of change, always with an eye to the randomness in historical developments. In a period of virulent nationalism, racism, anti-Semitism

and all the rest of it, Schlosser wanted to remind you that there was no inexorable reason for Vienna to become a center of musical patronage, or for Venice or Bruges to be centers for the sale and production of paintings.

Venice embodied his interests and approach as a center of art unmatched in its influence, but without an ancient history or even an indigenous population. Its traditions involved randomness, its citizens came from many places and traded with Byzantine and Muslim partners and themselves created and blended many traditions. Between the carnival and the religious tolerance, Venice again displayed the interplay of rational and irrational, festivities, ephemeral as well as more permanent artistic values.

Verona was a favorite subject due to the arbitrary mixture of courtly and bourgeois traditions, assimilating influences from the north and south as well as the west and the east. This had all of the romantic appeal as it still does for tourists. For Schlosser, the Romantics had performed the valuable role of beginning the objective and systematic study of history. Although some aspects of Romanticism had been silly, others were not [Schlosser had chosen F. W. J. Schelling as the topic for his examinations completing secondary school]. The patronage of Cangrande as an imperial ally, the exile of Dante, the relatively good preservation of the city made it a perfect example for him to describe for the interaction of large and diverse cultural forces.

Ferrara offered another example of a center for courtly art, as an example of artistic functions that distinguished themselves from the scholasticism of the church and the practical considerations of the bourgeoisie. He identified literary sources for a number of Dosso paintings, anticipating some of the work later done at the Warburg Institute.

Treviso was of interest as a relatively minor center which nonetheless enjoyed imperial patronage in the 14th century. It revealed the needs of an institution such as the Denkmalamt, but primarily showed the great amount of relevant information which one might find in a provincial place – anticipating historical scholarship of the later 20th century.

The Haggada manuscript in Sarajevo showed the interpenetration of the great religions, the mobility and reuse of an individual monument, much like the provincial 4th century coins from the Black Sea which he had catalogued as his first assignment as a young curator. It was the first Hebrew manuscript to be published as facsimile – another unpopular or radioactive subject which he insisted upon publishing as a constituent part of Austria-Hungary.

Lichtenberg Castle in southern Tyrol possessed unique medieval secular wall paintings made by an itinerant painter directly on the linguistic border between the Italian and the German speaking areas. It is comparable perhaps to Riegl's meditations on the significance of Salzburg in the history of art – where German and

Italian traditions are either melded or flourish side by side. These authors had grown up with a memory of the Austrian occupation of Lombardy, when the archive of Venice had been brought to Vienna. This book was published just three years before the area was ceded to Italy, and probably had a topical resonance during the war. While Riegl spoke rather vaguely about the Italianate tendencies in the art of Salzburg, Schlosser took a concrete provincial example and identified the patrons and the literary sources, and laid out everything that was known about them and stated modest conclusions about the technique, material state and the jumble of sacred and secular subjects.

Vienna itself provided an example of randomness in historical traditions and a lack of clear national characteristics. Schlosser discussed the cultural significance of Vienna at the end of *Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte* and in *Magistra Latinitas Magistra Barbaritas*. Like the traditions and collections of England, which he referred to in the *Kunst- und Wunderkammern*, the local pride and local traditions were relatively recent and embedded in a similar theatrical traditions.

A final aspect to mention about these studies are the working processes which were an important subject exemplifying the material basis for historical research in the humanities. The artist's workshop was among the topics of greatest interest to him.

The models used by sculptors and painters had never been studied so thoroughly. They were made of wood and wax both draped and not and were used by all artists throughout the centuries. The historical list of references to them comes from Cennini, Vasari, Baldinucci and many other sources.

Drawings had been collected but not so much studied within the context of the working process and their functions. Their use in the 14th and 15th centuries was the subject of one of his most penetrating early essays "Zur Kenntnis der künstlerischen Überlieferung im späten Mittelalter" his close and repeated attention to the book associated with Villard de Honnecourt, became the dissertation subject of his Assistent Hans Hahnloser, while Berta Segall wrote another dissertation about the function of drawings in the medieval period. This involved the conceptions of perspective notation and any other problems that would strike the reader as an anticipation of *Art and Illusion*.

The sociological just as the anthropological aspect was visible in the three basic spheres of 14th century northern Italian art – the courtly, the scholastic and the bourgeois. He continued to stress the social background when he was presenting Francisco Goya to a popular audience in the series of museum guides in the 1920's, or treating the subject of poverty in art. In the survey of wax portrait sculpture, one sees this aspect in the interplay among the social levels. One can see from his references, that he had discussed things with Heinrich Gomperz and other friends on the faculty of the university.

It should be obvious that one of his major contributions lay in the critical survey of documents relating to collectors and patrons in their influence on the arts themselves and on the shifting functions and uses. In charge of the Ambras collection, he disposed over all of the unusual subjects and exotic materials in unexpected combinations, also as vehicles of superstitions. It allowed him to be critical of the new building by Gottfried Semper of the Kunsthistorisches Museum. He would stress the size, diversity, inventorization and display of the collections and offer a more concrete historical approach than was common at the time. As an example, he offered an anthropological view of Jean de Berry, and published an observation about art collecting which was very abstract and strictly according to the terms used by Croce. The subject of the Dutch sculptors working for German patrons in the mannerist period again exemplified the international character, another criticism of the enthusiasm that was surrounding the writings of Riegl.

In the preface to Präludien, the volume of his collected essays published in 1927, he noted himself that his life seemed to be falling into two halves – as he said "juvenilia and virilia, hopefully not senilia". This would appear to refer to his ever more overt endorsement of the so-called neo-idealist position of Benedetto Croce and Karl Vossler, and the fact that his predictions about the future of Croce's influence were not animating scholarship as he thought this might happen. After the end of the monarchy, his publications reveal a shift that in some ways stood out as unique in the tradition in Vienna. After all of this pioneering work surrounding patronage and collecting, his philosophical position led him to stress the autonomy of art and of the artist. After all of these encyclopedic essays about artistic materials, long scale iconographic traditions, the influence of scholastic nominalism and realism on the arts, he suddenly began to urge the monographic study of individual works and individual artists. He began to praise Wölfflin. Why in the world would he suddenly do this? What would Wickhoff have said?

This change included factors which he himself liked to dismiss as extrinsic, or "*äußerlich*" – to use one of his favorite words. He had of course accepted the chair of art history after the sudden death of Max Dvořák in 1921, and thus became responsible for the administration of the academic department, which brought with it unwanted duties on university committees and no small amount of work in administering the examinations and the dissertations. He stated that his lectures had normally accompanied the research he was doing at the moment, and the university records confirm this. Aside from treating objects from the Vienna museums, the interest seems to have moved to the criticism of Vasari, "unfortunately the father of European art historical writings" as he phrased it more than once. The essay by Otto Kurz about Vasari's manipulation of sources in his narrative about Fra Filippo Lippi gives us an idea of what occurred in these seminars.

Although his best known and most committed students followed his teachings surprisingly closely, the topics of their work are astonishingly diverse.[viii] Yet Gombrich himself has recorded that many or even most of these had their origins in the lectures and seminars conducted by Schlosser. These included The Cast from Nature as a Work of Art in the Renaissance, The Meaning of the Gold Ground in Medieval Art, the Function of Drawings in Medieval art.

We must assume that the Herr Hofrat was devoting most of his time to his monograph about Lorenzo Ghiberti. Although this has been largely ignored in later scholarship, with identical disparaging remarks from R. Krautheimer to C. S. Wood, it has the importance of revealing to us his image of the original and influential artist. This had become the problem of the artistic monad from the Aesthetics of Croce.

In what became the final decade of his life, he published a series of essays about theoretical subjects and Quattrocento artists. These present a departure from his publications as a museum curator. They include the most important statement of his thoughts *Stilgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte*. Bombast and references to national qualities and other specific phrases have been misunderstood by authors writing after the Second World War and in other countries. He had originally been a student of literature, and as an introverted person raised in the middle class during the monarchy, this led to his ornate style of writing and speaking. It was difficult to follow in both modes, and in the early phase showed a distinct unwillingness to state anything negative about other colleagues, this changed in the difficult interwar period. The confrontation with Strzygowski had certainly affected him, and we know from Eva Frodl that he had had a stroke which affected his stamina and left physical traces.

We cannot know what went on in his mind in the final years before the Anschluß. A certain change seems to have come over him. His lectures were no longer based on anonymous medieval material, but rather on the Renaissance, the greatest artists, such as Ghiberti and Piero della Francesca, and then on those whom he considered to be non artists, such as Alberti and Uccello. A lecture such as that on *Stilgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte* lacks none of his congenital subtlety, which has usually been overlooked, but is consistent with his distinction between style and language in art, originality and lack of it, as he had been stressing since the earliest years of the 20th century. The shift from medieval to Renaissance topics might have been as random as is the increased reference to architecture. Although he distanced himself from Sedlmayr and felt deeply antagonistic, there are moments when one has the impression that he would have blessed some of those essays as a continuation of his own approach.

[viii] For a list of Schlosser's students' dissertation topics see his 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Institut für Geschichtsforschung*, Ergänzungs-Band 13, Heft 2, Innsbruck: Wagner 1934, 223-226. The list of Vienna School students was added to Schlosser's essay by Hans Hahnloser.

He seems to have remained a conservative bureaucrat, wistful at times for the quiet period of the monarchy, and like Croce, probably without sympathy for socialists of any sort. His own humanist education and consistent objections to Strzygowski make this abundantly clear. When he made negative remarks to Vossler about Tietze as a Jew, these were in private within an academic context, and they referred to the quality of some of his more recent his work and not his affability as a person [He was recalling to Vossler the simple fact that by that time, Tietze's application in Munich would be rejected because the new race laws]. The same correspondence includes his sardonic remarks about Mussolini. There can be no doubt about this. A strange remark within his lecture in the Warburg library about the weakness of pacifists might have been made to show that he agreed with Warburg himself in that matter. His final letter to Croce, written shortly before his death includes his efforts to find a publisher for the dissertation of Ernst Saenger, which he had previously secured for the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*, but had then been later rejected due to the racial origins of its author. He was doing the same for Josef Bodonyi, and further references within his writings prove to us that in spite of certain awkward expressions in his later lectures, he remained consistent in his idea of objectivity in scholarship.

There can be no doubt that his critical acumen had made him one of the most influential teachers in spite of himself. Even a figure such as Julius Held, who studied in Vienna for one year [and discovered his dissertation topic there from Ludwig Baldass], and than had a career in baroque painting which would not have fascinated Schlosser to the same degree, recently stated that Schlosser had been one of his most inspiring teachers.

From references in his letters and publications, it seems clear that he was proud of having taught students who – as he himself remarked – knew the material better than he. Even those such as Pächt and Sedlmayr who were obtrusive in refusing to take the courses in the Institut für Geschichtsforschung and spoke of Riegl and Dvořák as their true teachers, even they show the very marked influence from this man.

When Ernst Gombrich developed the methods of Schlosser and had a lasting influence in England and the United States, it was Pächt who answered with his lectures about method, and chose the word "Praxis" as the linchpin for the arguments against them. If the history of art is to become objective, and if the criterion for science is observability, then Pächt reminds us that style is the only aspect of the art work one can return to for verification. While we have seen a revival of Riegl in the last years, I recall as a student reading historians proclaiming their discovery of anthropological approaches to succeed the sociological models they had been following. I always thought that this might allow the works of Schlosser to be appreciated again, but alas, this has never happened. I do believe that even if he was underappreciated, his influence had entered the gene pool by the very fact that he was the successor to so popular a teacher as Dvořák. As a respected scholar two generations older than his pupils, he would have appeared as a local fixture,

unrivalled in his knowledge of art theory, relic of the monarchy perhaps, but certainly the keeper of the local flame. Since his teachings were more consistent and less speculative than others, it was inevitable that something would survive beyond the revised editions of the *Kunstliteratur*.

Even if the younger generation might not have been as consumed with Croce, Schlosser nevertheless remained the voice of the Vienna School though the 1920's and 1930's, and much of his achievements exerted their influence unnoticed or unacknowledged. A final example might be taken from Otto Pächt who seems to have done his examinations with Schlosser simply because he was the successor to Dvořák. Pächt is quoted as naming Riegl as his teacher, and [other than in the opening page of his dissertation] I do not recall any mention of Schlosser in his writings. Nonetheless, he shows their traces either conscious or not. Pächt argued that the earliest instance of the theme of St. Jerome in his Study is based on a reading of the Duc de Berry inventory. That inventory had been among Schlosser's favorite topics. As an example of abstruse iconography in his Method lectures, he used the same example of the "Etimasia" as Schlosser and Bodonyi had done before him. In his lecture from Bonn in 1964, arguing against the overemphasis on iconographical studies, he ends by saying that those aspects are purely extrinsic to the true inner development of art. His very words repeat some of the favorite phrases of his Doktorvater. In fact this influence of a difficult teacher on his brilliant but independent students is quite an interesting subject, but that will have to be a story for another day. [I show you the annotated copy by Norbert Wibiral, in which the phrase "actual internal development" is annotated by Wibiral with comments such as "*Blech*" and "what is this supposed to actually mean?"]

Karl Johns (Independent), Riverside CA and Klosterneuburg

karltjohns@gmail.com